



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,473	10/07/2003	Laszlo T. Nemeth	108089	5206
23490	7590	03/23/2006	EXAMINER	
JOHN G TOLOMEI, PATENT DEPARTMENT UOP LLC 25 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD P O BOX 5017 DES PLAINES, IL 60017-5017			TOOMER, CEPHIA D	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1714		
DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/680,473	NEMETH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cephia D. Toomer	1714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4,6,9-12 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 5,7 and 13-18 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 is rejected because the term "high" is a relative term that does not have a comparative value.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Noveon.

Noveon teaches a solid fuel gel comprising 0.5% Carbopol EZ-3 (polyacrylilc compound), 24% water and 75% methanol (see abstract in its entirety).

Accordingly, Noveon teaching all the limitations of the claims anticipates the claims.

6. Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Monick (US 3,183,068).

Monick teaches fuel gels comprising 60-95% alcohol (methanol or ethanol), 2-6% of a gelling agent (carboxy vinyl polymers, copolymers of maleic anhydride with olefinic type material, etc)(see col. 1, lines 8-11,64-69; col.2, lines 1-7;col. 3, lines 25-40). The fuel also contains metal salts (see col. 3, lines 14-19).

Accordingly, Monick teaching all the limitations of the claims anticipates the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 9-12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Finkelshtain (US 6,554,877).

Finkelshtain teaches fuel compositions for fuel cells comprising metal oxygenates such as sodium bis (2-methoxyethoxy) dihydridaluminate (see abstract; col. 4, lines 39-44) and a metal hydride such as Li, Na, K hydrides (see col. 4, lines 39-44). The composition contains the electrolyte, KOH (see col. 5, lines 46-47).

Finkelshtain teaches the limitations of the claims other than the differences that are discussed below.

Finkelshtain fails to teach that the fuel is in solid form. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the composition as a solid fuel in order to produce a fuel that is easier to handle and will not flow out of the openings in the fuel cell.

9. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noveon.

Noveon has been discussed above. Noveon fails to teach the claimed amount of acrylic polymer. However, it would have been obvious it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the proportions of the acrylic polymer through routine experimentation for best results. As to optimization results, a patent will not be granted based upon the optimization of result effective variables when the optimization is obtained through routine experimentation unless there is a showing of unexpected results which properly rebuts the *prima facie* case of obviousness. See *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 276, 205 USPQ 215, 219 (CCPA 1980). See also *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936-37 (Fed. Cir. 1990), and *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

10. Claims 5, 7 and 13-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art fails to teach the combination of acetaldehyde and acrylic polymer or solid antioxidant, solid catalyst or gelled oxygenate with the claimed metal oxygenates.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cephia D. Toomer whose telephone number is 571-272-1126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cephia D. Toomer

Application/Control Number: 10/680,473
Art Unit: 1714

Page 6

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1714

10680473\031906